

DEVELOPMENT AND PANCHAYATS DEPARTMENT

The 17th February, 1981

No. EP-KKR-G-81/2.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (2) of section 4 and section 5 of the Punjab Gram Panchayat Act, 1952 (Punjab Act 4 of 1953), and all other powers enabling him in this behalf, and in supersession of all the previous notifications issued in this behalf, the Governor of Haryana hereby declares the village or group of villages specified in column 2 of the Schedule given below to be Sabha area and establishes a Gram Panchayat for every Sabha area by the name specified against each in column 5 of the said schedule, which shall consist of such number of panches, including sarpanch, as is specified against each Gram Panchayat in column 6 thereof out of which the number of panches belonging to the Scheduled Castes shall be mentioned in column 7 of said Schedule :—

SCHEDULE

Serial No.	Name(s) of village(s) constituting Sabha area	Tehsil	District	Name of Gram Panchayat	No. of Panches including Sarpanch	No. of Panches belonging to Scheduled Caste
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	Badsui	Guhla	Kurukshetra	Badsui	5	1
4(a)	Kallar Majra	Do	Do	Kallar Majra	5	1

SUKHDEV PARSAD, Secy.

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENTS

The 16th December, 1980

No. 10(314)-79-5Lab.—In exercise of the powers conferred under section 88 of the E.S.I. Act, 1948, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to exempt the following Sales/Medical Representatives of M/s. Yamuna Syndicate Ltd., Yamuna Nagar, from the operation of the E.S.I. Act, 1948 (as amended):—

Sr. No.	Name of the employee	Place of posting of Sales/Medical Representative	Period of exemption
<i>SarvsAri</i> —			
1	Harbans Lal Khanna	Bilaspur (Haryana)	10th November, 1979 to 9th November, 1980
2	Madan Lal Sharma	Ditto	15th June, 1980 to 14th June, 1981
3	Karam Singh	Ditto	19th June, 1980 to 18th June, 1981
4	Raj Pal	Ditto	19th June, 1980 to 18th June, 1981
5	Ravi Dutt	Ditto	5th July, 1979 to 4th July, 1980
6	Bansi Lal Kapoor	Shahabad (Haryana)	1st May, 1980 to 30th April, 1981
7	Prem Nath	Ditto	1st May, 1980 to 30th April, 1981

Sr. No.	Name of the Employee	Place of posting of Sale/Medical Representative	Period of Exemption
8	Darshan Singh	Shahabab (Haryana)	1st July, 1980 to 30th June, 1981
9	Mohan Singh	Ditto	17th May, 1980 to 16th May, 1981
10	Fakir Singh	Ditto	1st July, 1980 to 30th April, 1981
11	Amarjit Singh	Ditto	1st April, 1980 to 31st March, 1981
12	Harish Chander Punj	Ditto	1st May, 1980 to 30th April, 1981
13	Jai Dev Nagpal	Thanesar (Haryana)	1st May, 1980 to 30th April, 1981
14	Janki Nath Anand	Ditto	Ditto
15	Ram Baran	Ditto	Ditto
16	Darshan Singh	Ditto	Ditto
17	Parkash Chander Jain	Ditto	Ditto
18	M. P. Sharma	Ditto	Ditto
19	Zila Singh	Ditto	Ditto
20	Y. K. Diwan	Ditto	Ditto
21	Satish Kumar Kapoor	Ditto	Ditto
22	Vijay Kumar Sharma	Ditto	Dito
23	Kalwant Singh	Ditto	Ditto
24	Bal Krishan Madok	Ditto	1st April, 1980 to 31st March, 1981
25	Balbir Singh	Ditto	1st November, 1979 to 31st October, 1980
26	Joginder Singh	Ditto	1st May, 1980 to 30th April, 1981
27	Raj Kumar	Ditto	8th April, 1980 to 7th April, 1981
28	Ramesh Kumar	Ditto	1st January, 1980 to 31st December, 1980
29	Jasbir Singh	Ditto	1st September, 1979 to 31st August, 1980
30	Raj Kumar Sharma	Ditto	21st May, 1980 to 20th May, 1981
31	Ashok Kumar	Ditto	7th April, 1980 to 6th April, 1981
32	Shiv Kumar Sharma	Ditto	1st September, 1979 to 31st August, 1980
33	Balihar Singh	Ditto	Ditto
34	Yudh Raj	Ditto	1st April 1980 to 31st March 1981

The above exemption is subject to the following conditions mentioned below :—

1. The aforesaid factory wherein the employees are employed shall maintain a register showing the names and designations of the exempted employees ;
2. Notwithstanding this exemption, the employees shall continue to receive such benefits under the said Act to which they might have become entitled to on the basis of the contribution paid prior to the date from which exemption granted by this Notification operates;
3. The contributions for the exempted period, if already paid, shall not be refunded ;
4. The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period) such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;
5. Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of :—
 - (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (i) of section 44 for the said period ; or
 - (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950, for the period ; or
 - (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this Notification ; or
 - (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act had been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory be empowered to—
 - (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or
 - (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found in charge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such documents, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary ; or
 - (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent, or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises, or any persons whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employer ; or
 - (d) make copies or take extracts from any register, account book, or other documents maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

H. L. GUGNANI, Commr. and Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 22nd January, 1981

No. 9 (1)-81-8Lab/24.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Haryana Polymer Corporation, Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 24 of 1980

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA POLYMER CORPORATION, FARIDABAD.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/73-79/11484 dated, 4th March, 1980, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Haryana Polymer Corporation, Faridabad and its workmen, to this Tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of bonus @ 20% for the year 1978-79? If so, with what details?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared. No. formal claim statement or written statement was filed by the parties, though the management took opportunities to file written statement but they stopped their appearance in the case. The case was fixed for *ex parte* evidence of the workmen, who examined one witness Shri Charan Singh the workman. He made a statement that the management was employing 30—40 workmen and the management was making good profits. The workmen did not summon any record, so much so, even balance sheet was not placed on the file. On the bald statement of a single workman issue of bonus cannot be decided. It would have been better for the workmen had they sought assistance of the Court to produce balance sheet and other documents of the management. The workmen have failed to discharge their burden of proof in the case.

Therefore, I give my award that the workmen are not entitled to the grant of bonus in the present reference.

Dated the 22nd December, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,

Presiding Officer Industrial Tribunal,
Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 1162, dated 26th December, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal,
Haryana, Faridabad

No. 9(1)-81-8Lab/35.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Rubberway, Faridabad Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER,
INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 533 of 1978

between

Shri Piare Lal, workman and the management of M/s Rubberways, Faridabad Private Limited, Faridabad.

AWARD

By order No. ID/FD/11/209-89/52137, dated 22nd November, 1978, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Rubberways (Frd) Pvt. Ltd., Faridabad and its workman Shri Piare Lal, to this Tribunal for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of the section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Piare Lal was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

On receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 17th June, 1979 and the case was fixed for the evidence of the workman, who examined Shri Piare Lal as WW-1 and Shri Hari Bahadur as WW-2 and closed his case. Then the case was fixed for the evidence of the management. On the last date of hearing, the representative for the workman made a statement that he did not want to pursue the present reference and further stated that the demand notice was erroneously served upon this management because the workman and employee of M/s. Rubberways, Faridabad and

not Rubberrways, Faridabad Pvt. Ltd. In these circumstances, I allow the withdrawal of this reference and give permission to the workman to agitate his claim against his employer.

Dated, the 22nd December, 1980.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer, Industrial,
Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 1159, dated the 26th December, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to the Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :

M. C. BHARDWAJ,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)81-8Lab/317.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Milk Plant, Jind :—

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTK

Reference No. 188 of 1980

between

SHRI PREM SINGH SUNAR, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF
MILK PLANT, JIND

Present :—

No one for either side.

AWARD

This reference No. 188 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor,—*vide* his order No. ID/KNL/81-80/46592, dated 3rd September, 1980 u/s 10(1)(c) of the I. D. Act for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Prem Singh, workman and the management of M/s Milk Plant, Jind. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Prem Singh was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On the receipt of the order of reference, notices, as usual, were sent to the parties who appeared in response to the same. The workman appeared through his authorised representative Shri S. N. Vats. On the request of the representative of the workman, fresh notice was issued under regd. A. D. to the workman on his own address for 8th December, 1980. On this date of hearing neither the workman nor his authorised representative appeared despite the service of notice to the workman, the proof is the A. D. which is on the file. This indicated the lack of interest in the workman, in pursuing his case leading me to reach the conclusion that the workman in fact had no dispute with the management. The section of the management in terminating his services is therefore, legal and justified and the workman is not entitled to any relief. The reference is answered and returned in the above terms. No order as to costs.

Dated the 20th December, 1980.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endorsment No. 98, dated the 1st January, 1981

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the I. D. Act.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

H. L. GUGNANI, Secy.